

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RONALD J. ALLISON,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOOKING OFFICERS OF CCDC,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-00479-RFB-EJY

ORDER

Plaintiff Ronald J. Allison brings this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while incarcerated at Clark County Detention Center. (ECF No. 1-1). On June 27, 2022, this Court ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint by July 27, 2022. (ECF No. 3). The Court warned Plaintiff that the action could be dismissed if he failed to file an amended complaint by that deadline. (*Id.* at 10). That deadline expired and Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint or move for an extension.

I. DISCUSSION

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets, and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. See Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. See In re

1 Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig., 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting
2 Malone, 833 F.2d at 130).

3 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation
4 and the Court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissing Plaintiff's
5 claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal
6 because a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing
7 a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See Anderson v. Air West, 542
8 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of
9 cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

10 The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can
11 be used to correct the party's failure that brought about the Court's need to consider
12 dismissal. See Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining
13 that considering less drastic alternatives before the party has disobeyed a court order
14 does not satisfy this factor); accord Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th
15 Cir. 2002) (explaining that “the persuasive force of” earlier Ninth Circuit cases that
16 “implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic alternatives prior to disobedience of the court's
17 order as satisfying this element[.]” i.e., like the “initial granting of leave to amend coupled
18 with the warning of dismissal for failure to comply[.]” have been “eroded” by Yourish).
19 Courts “need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a
20 case, but must explore possible and meaningful alternatives.” Henderson v. Duncan, 779
21 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed until and
22 unless Plaintiff files an amended complaint, the only alternative is to enter a second order
23 setting another deadline. But the reality of repeating an ignored order is that it often only
24 delays the inevitable and squanders the Court's finite resources. The circumstances here
25 do not indicate that this case will be an exception: there is no hint that Plaintiff needs
26 additional time or evidence that he did not receive the Court's screening order. Setting
27 another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth
28 factor favors dismissal.

II. CONCLUSION

Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, the Court finds that they weigh in favor of dismissal. It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on Plaintiff's failure to file an amended complaint in compliance with this Court's June 27, 2022, order. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case. No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case. If Plaintiff wishes to pursue his claims and is able to identify some Defendants by name, he must file a complaint in a new case.

DATED: April 18, 2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'RFB', is written above a horizontal line.

RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE